REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-55 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 13, 22, and 55 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2008, Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-54 remain in this application with Claim 55 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new Claim 56 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I.   Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Huynh for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 23, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the claims may overcome the cited references, but that an updated search would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

20

II.   Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 7-16, 19-21, 33, 36-40, 43-46, and 51-54
        Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 4, 7-16, 19-21, 33, 36-40, 43-46, and 51-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,922,559 ("*Mohammed*") in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0139180 ("*McIntosh*") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0157007 ("*Sashihara*"). Claims 1 and 13 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the cited references and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server." Amended Claim 13 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 11-22.

Consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital cordless handset's user. (*See*

specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.) Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, *Mohammed* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server which manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed*, memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

Furthermore, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Mohammed's* deficiencies. *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh*, user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed*, *McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Moreover, *Sashihara* does not overcome *Mohammed's* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Sashihara* merely discloses providing access-point user authentication. (*See Sashihara*, Abstract.) In *Sashihara*, an access point serves as an entrance to a wired network for terminals that use a wireless network. (*See Sashihara*, para. [0019].) Like *Mohammed* and *McIntosh, Sashihara* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Sashihara* merely discloses user authentication at an access point.

Combining *Mohammed* with *McIntosh* and *Sashihara* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Sashihara* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 13 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 13 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 13.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 7-12, 14-16, 19-21, 33, 36-40, 43-46, and 51-54 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 13, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4, 7-12, 14-16, 19-21, 33, 36-40, 43-46, and 51-54.

III.   Rejection of Claims 39 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 39 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mohammed* in view of *McIntosh* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,817 ("*Kung*"). Dependent Claims 39 and 50 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that they each include, due to their dependency on independent Claim 13, "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server." Dependent Claim 49 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that it includes a similar recitation due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 1. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 11-22.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital cordless handset's user. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network

24

may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.) Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, and as previously established, *Mohammed* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server which manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed*, memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

As further stated above, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Mohammed's* deficiencies. *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh*, user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed*, *McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Moreover, *Kung* does not overcome *Mohammed's* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Kung* merely discloses providing broadband access capabilities with a packetized network. (*See Kung*, col. 1, lines 61-64.) In *Kung*, a conference server provides multiparty conference calls using IP voice packets during an IP telephony or multimedia session call. (*See Kung*, col. 13, lines 27-41.) Like *Mohammed* and *McIntosh*, *Kung* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Kung* merely discloses providing broadband access capabilities with a packetized network.

Combining *Mohammed* with *McIntosh* and *Kung* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Kung* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server," as included in dependent Claim 39. Dependent Claims 49-50 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, dependent Claims 39 and 49-50 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 39 and 49-50.

IV.   Rejection of Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mohammed* in view of *McIntosh* in further view of *Kung* and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0114603 ("*Suhail*"). Dependent

Claim 35 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that it includes, due to its dependency on independent Claim 13, "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 11-22.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital cordless handset's user. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.) Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, and as previously established, *Mohammed* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 13. For example, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server which manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed*, memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

As further stated above, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Mohammed's* deficiencies. *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh*, user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed*, *McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Furthermore, and as stated above, *Kung* does not overcome *Mohammed's* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Kung* merely discloses providing broadband access capabilities with a packetized network. (*See Kung*, col. 1, lines 61-64.) In *Kung*, a conference server provides multiparty conference calls using IP voice packets during an IP telephony or multimedia session call. (*See Kung*, col. 13, lines 27-41.) Like

28

Mohammed and *McIntosh, Kung* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Kung* merely discloses providing broadband access capabilities with a packetized network.

Moreover, *Suhail* does not overcome *Mohammed's, McIntosh's,* and *Kung's* deficiencies. *Suhail* merely discloses that a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) assists in providing advanced telephony services using Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) over a digital communication network. (*See Suhail*, para. [0007].) In *Suhail*, SIP telephones are intelligent devices that contain processors that are independent from a central switching location and have one or more processors to create, modify, and terminate communication sessions. (*See Suhail*, para. [0021].) Like *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Kung, Suhail* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Suhail* merely discloses a protocol for providing services over VoIP.

Combining *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Kung* with *Suhail* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Mohammed, McIntosh, Kung,* and *Suhail* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server," as included in dependent Claim 35. Accordingly, dependent Claim 35 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 35.

V.   Rejection of Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 17 and 18 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mohammed* in view of *McIntosh* in further

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,474 ("*Sinha*"). Dependent Claims 17 and 18 are each

patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the reason that they

each include, due to their dependency on independent Claim 13, "wherein determining

features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the

SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and

"wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset

comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application

server." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page

10, lines 11-22.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless

handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's

identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may

attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a

wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification

information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home

Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital

cordless handset's user. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network

may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital

cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the

information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.)

30

Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, and as previously established, *Mohammed* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 13. For example, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server which manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed*, memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

Furthermore, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Mohammed's* deficiencies. As stated above, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh*, user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed*, *McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Moreover, *Sinha* does not overcome *Mohammed's* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Sinha* merely discloses providing a consistent user interface that is user-access method to a gateway device independent and that is data network independent. (*See Sinha*, Abstract.) *Sinha* allows a telephone network to route incoming calls to corresponding IP addresses that are associated with voip-names. (*See Sinha*, col. 7, lines 25-40.) Like *Mohammed* and *McIntosh, Sinha* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Sinha* merely discloses providing a consistent user interface that is user-access method to a gateway device independent and that is data network independent.

Combining *Mohammed* with *McIntosh* and *Sinha* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Sinha* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server," as included in dependent Claims 17-18. Accordingly, dependent Claims 17-18 are each patentably distinguishable over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 17-18.

VI.   Rejection of Claims 22-23, 25-32, 41-42, and 47-48 Under 35 U.S.C. §
       103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 22-23, 25-32, 41-42, and

47-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,853,851

("*Rautiola*") in view of *Mohammed* in view of *McIntosh* and in further view of *Sashihara*.

Claim 22 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the claim, as

amended, overcomes the cited references and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 22 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the

reason that it recites, for example, "wherein determining features provided to the dual

mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the

identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within

restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining

restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server." Support for this

amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 11-22.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless

handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's

identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may

attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a

wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification

information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home

Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital

cordless handset's user. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network

may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital

cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the

information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.) Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, *Rautiola* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 22. For example, *Rautiola* merely discloses a mobile station in a wireless intranet office environment. (*See* col. 6, lines 31-33.) When outside this environment, the mobile station acts as a normal Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) phone connecting to a public GSM network base transceiver station (BTS). (*See* col. 6, lines 33-34.) However, when *Rautiola's* mobile station is in the wireless intranet office environment, the mobile station may operate in one of two modes. (*See* col. 6, lines 34-36.) In one mode, the mobile station connects to a personal base unit (e.g. either with an inter-connection cable, a infra-red connection, or with low power RF transmitter and receiver). (*See* col. 6, lines 36-38.) In another mode, *Rautiola's* mobile station connects to a GSM base transceiver station. (*See* col. 6, lines 38-40.) In *Rautiola*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Rautiola* merely discloses that in one mode, a mobile station connects to a personal base unit.

As established above, *Mohammed* does not overcome *Rautiola's* deficiencies. For example, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server which manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed*, memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed

wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed*, col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed*, restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

As further established above, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Rautiola's* and *Mohammed's* deficiencies. *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh*, user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh*, para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed*, *McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Moreover, *Sashihara* does not overcome *Rautiola's, Mohammed's* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Sashihara* merely discloses providing access-point user authentication. (*See Sashihara*, Abstract.) In *Sashihara*, an access point serves as an entrance to a wired network for terminals that use a wireless network. (*See Sashihara*, para. [0019].) Like *Mohammed* and *McIntosh*, *Sashihara* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *Sashihara* merely discloses user authentication at an access point.

Combining *Rautiola* with *Mohammed, McIntosh*, and *Sashihara* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Rautiola, Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Sashihara* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises

35

comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the

HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital

cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented

by an application server," as recited by amended Claim 22. Accordingly, independent

Claim 22 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully

request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 22.

Dependent Claims 23, 25-32, 41-42, and 47-48 are also allowable at least for the

reasons described above regarding independent Claim 22, and by virtue of their

dependency upon independent Claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request

withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 23, 25-32, 41-42, and 47-48.

VII. Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rautiola* in view of *Mohammed* in view of *McIntosh*

and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,868,072 ("*Lin*"). Dependent Claim 24 is

patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least for the reason that it

includes, due to its dependency on amended independent Claim 22, "wherein

determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises

comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the

HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital

cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented

by an application server." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification

at least on page 10, lines 11-22.

As stated above, consistent with exemplary embodiments, a digital cordless handset may contain a Subscriber Identity Module (SIM) card that may store a user's identity and service provider. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 3-5.) The user may attempt to access voice and data services by using the digital cordless handset within a wireless access point's range. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) Identification information obtained from the SIM card may be compared to information in a Home Location Register (HLR) to determine what features should be provided to the digital cordless handset's user. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 5-10.) A wired data network may be linked to a softswitch, which may interconnect an application server to the digital cordless handset to provide various voice and data services as dictated by the information maintained by the HLR. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 11-15.) Restrictions on the digital cordless handset's use may be defined and implemented by the application server to limit a call amount or time per call. (*See* specification, page 10, lines 19-22.)

In contrast, and as previously stated, *Rautiola* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 22. For example, *Rautiola* merely discloses a mobile station in a wireless intranet office environment. (*See* col. 6, lines 31-33.) When outside this environment, the mobile station acts as a normal Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) phone connecting to a public GSM network base transceiver station (BTS.) (*See* col. 6, lines 33-34.) However, when *Rautiola's* mobile station is in the wireless intranet office environment, the mobile station may operate in one of two modes. (*See* col. 6, lines 34-36.) In one mode, the mobile station connects to a personal base unit (e.g. either with an inter-connection cable, a infra-red connection, or

with low power RF transmitter and receiver.) (*See* col. 6, lines 36-38.) In another mode, *Rautiola's* mobile station connects to a GSM base transceiver station. (*See* col. 6, lines 38-40.) In *Rautiola,* restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather *Rautiola* merely discloses that in one mode, a mobile station connects to a personal base unit.

Furthermore, *Mohammed* does not overcome *Rautiola's* deficiencies. For example, and as stated above, *Mohammed* merely discloses a system server that manages subscriber devices' mobility between a landline-based unlicensed wireless service from a base station and a licensed wireless service. (*See Mohammed,* col. 8, lines 6-10.) In *Mohammed,* memory in the system server stores various application programs such as system bridge programs for handling transitions in service from licensed to unlicensed wireless services and vice versa. (*See Mohammed,* col. 8, lines 39-58.) In *Mohammed,* restrictions are not imposed on a handset. Rather, *Mohammed* merely discloses migrating calls between different wireless services.

In turn, *McIntosh* does not overcome *Rautiola's* and *Mohammed's* deficiencies. As previously established, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network. In *McIntosh,* user equipment is coupled to a SIM supporting authentication and encryption to enable communication with a public network. (*See McIntosh,* para. [0054].) *McIntosh's* SIM enables access to value added services provided by a private cellular network. (*See McIntosh,* para. [0057].) Like *Mohammed, McIntosh* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather, *McIntosh* merely discloses coupling a wireless local area network to a public network.

Moreover, *Lin* does not overcome *Rautiola's, Mohammed's,* and *McIntosh's* deficiencies. *Lin* merely discloses home phone line network devices that conforms to different standards versions and that are interconnected and interoperable on a UTP transmission medium. (*See* Abstract.) Higher order devices in *Lin* support an overlaid dual logical network structure that allows two pair of higher order devices to communicate simultaneously using two separate frequency bands. (*See* Abstract.) Like *Rautiola, Mohammed,* and *McIntosh, Lin* at least does not disclose imposing restrictions on a handset. Rather *Lin* merely discloses home phone line network devices that are interconnected and interoperable on a UTP transmission medium.

Combining *Rautiola* with *Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Lin* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Rautiola, Mohammed, McIntosh,* and *Lin* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "wherein determining features provided to the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises comparing the SIM card information to the identification information provided by the HLR," and "wherein operating within restrictions defined for the dual mode digital cordless handset comprises determining restrictions on use defined and implemented by an application server," as included in dependent Claim 24. Accordingly, dependent Claim 24 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 24.

VIII.   Rejection of Claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0030791 ("*Dorenbosch*") in view of *Mohammed* and further in view of *Sashihara*. Claim 55 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 55.

IX.   New Claim

Claim 56 has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is allowable over the cited art at least because it recites "means for providing identification information comprising means for communicating subscriber identity module (SIM) information, the SIM information being used to determine services and restrictions applied to the dual mode wireless device." New Claim 56 adds no new matter.

X.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the claimed subject matter that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims.

Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: November 11, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/
_____

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

39262
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

41